

## **REMARKS**

The Final Office Action dated March 19, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-5 and 7 are pending. Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Khosla et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,202,061.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with, and explicitly traverses, the Examiner's reason for rejecting the claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A system for enabling a user to manipulate a user interface, the system comprising:

receiving means conceived to receive a selection from the user;

obtaining means to obtain at least one collection that matches the selection;

generating means conceived to generate a generated-collection that comprises at least one item, wherein each item in the generated-collection matches the selection; and

presentation means conceived to present to the user, through the user interface, an overview of the generated-collection and the at least one collection that matches the selection.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 3 to more clearly define the invention. In particular, each of these independent claims recites that the selection by a user results in an overview being presented to the user. This overview contains:

1. At least one collection that matches the selection, and
2. A generated-collection that comprises at least one item, obtained by a generating means, and wherein each item matches the selection.

Support for these features is found, inter alia, at paragraphs [0006] and [0021] of the published application. Paragraph [0006] also contains the following example:

For example, in the case that a user wants to select all music albums of a certain artist, the user can be provided with all music albums of that artist and with a generated album that comprises songs of the artist that are for example present upon different albums comprising a collection of songs of several artists. In this way, the user is provided with a user interface, that can show real albums and a generated album that comprises songs of the artist.

Applicant respectfully submits that Khosla does not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed subject matter quoted above. The system of Khosla allows the user to perform a search of picture properties (see col. 11, lines, 1-6). As illustrated in Fig. 11, the system of Khosla displays a thumbnail of each image found in a search (see col. 11, lines 47-51). Relying on a user's interaction, the Khosla's invention subsequently generates a new album containing pictures found in a search.

Further, Kosla's initially generated album contains items that do not match the selection, contrary to the language of claim 1. That is, amended claim 1 recites that each

item of such a generated collection matches the selection. That Kosla does not teach this feature is clearly illustrated by the Office Action itself in which the Examiner points to item 803 of Fig. 12E as teaching the claim feature of generating a generated-collection. The shoe box collection 803 contains a plurality of items (e.g., Eiffel Tower) that do not match the selection criteria. Khosla permits the user to subsequently, manually select items (e.g. roses) from the shoe box collection to create a generated collection.

In addition, Applicant submits that Khosla fails to properly address item 1, listed above, of the two items presented in the overview – a collection that matches the selection. The Examiner points to steps 907 – 911 of Fig. 9 and item 309 of Fig. 12E as teaching this feature. These references to Khosla relate to a manual process by the user – not a collection obtained by a matching process performed by the system.

For at least the above reasons, the system of Khosla does not display the system of claim 1 which presents to a user an overview that contains at least one collection that matches the user's selection and a generated-collection that comprises at least one item, obtained by a generating means, wherein each item therein matches the selection.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference. Khosla cannot be said to anticipate the present invention, because Khosla fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 1. Claim 3 also contains these features and is deemed patentable over Khosla for at least the same reasons.

Having shown that Khosla fails to disclose each and every element claimed, applicant submits that the reason for the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 3 have been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1 and 3

With regard to claims 2, 4, 5 and 7, these claims ultimately depend from one of the independent claims, which have been shown to be not anticipated and allowable in view of the cited references. Accordingly, claims 2, 4, 5 and 7 are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski  
Registration No. 42,079



By: Thomas Onka  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,053

Date: May 18, 2008

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615